



## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application of: Waldmann, et al.  
Serial No.: 10/615,718  
Filed: July 9, 2003  
For: Therapeutic Antibodies with Reduced Side Effect  
Group: 1643  
Examiner: Blanchard

Commissioner for Patents  
Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

### APPEAL BRIEF

#### INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

This is an Appeal from the Final Rejection mailed January 29, 2008.

#### Statement of Real Party in Interest

The real party in interest is Isis Innovation Ltd., which is owned by Oxford University of Oxford, United Kingdom.

#### Statement of Related Cases

There are no related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings with respect to the above-identified application. There are no continuing applications of the above-identified application. There is a related application, Serial No. 09/979,845, whose claimed subject matter has been allowed.

### Jurisdictional Statement

This is an appeal under 35 U.S.C. 134 from the Final Rejection mailed January 29, 2008. The Notice of Appeal from the Final Rejection was filed on July 18, 2008. A petition for extension of time is being filed concurrently with this Appeal Brief.

## Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Introductory Remarks .....	1
Statement of Real Party in Interest.....	1
Statement of Related Cases.....	1
Jurisdictional Statement .....	2
Table of Authorities .....	5
Status of Amendments .....	6
Grounds of Rejection to Be Reviewed.....	6
Statement of Facts .....	7
Argument.....	10
The Rejection of Claims 1, 6, 9, 10 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) .....	10
The Rejection of Claims 1, 6-10, 12-15, and 17 Under 35 U.S.C. 112, First Paragraph, As Failing to Comply with the Written Description Requirement in that the Claims Contain Subject Matter, Which Does Not Convey to One Skilled in the Art that the Inventors Had Possession of the Claimed Invention.....	14
The Rejection of Claims 1, 6-10 12-15, and 17 Under 35 U.S.C. 112, First Paragraph, for Failing to Provide an Enabling Disclosure .....	16

The Rejection of Claims 1, 6-10, 12-15, and 17 Under 35 U.S.C. 112, First Paragraph, as Failing to Comply with the Written Description Requirement as Introducing New Matter.....	19
The Provisional Rejection of Claims 1, 6-10, 12-15, and 17 Under the Judicially Created Doctrine of Obviousness-type Double Patenting Over Co-pending Application Serial No. 09/979,948.....	20
Conclusion .....	21
Appendix .....	22
Clean Copy of Claims on Appeal.....	22
Claim Support Section.....	24

## Table of Authorities

	<u>Page</u>
35 U.S.C. 102.....	5, 8, 10
35 U.S.C. 112 .....	5, 6, 11, 12, 15
35 U.S.C. 134 .....	2

### Status of Amendments

A response to the Final Rejection of January 29, 2008 was filed on June 2, 2008. In such response, the claims were not amended. The Examiner, in an Advisory Action mailed June 18, 2008, indicated that the response would be entered.

### Grounds of Rejection to Be Reviewed

1. The rejection of Claims 1, 6, 9, 10, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hale, Immunotechnology, Vol. 1, pgs. 175-187.

2. The rejection of Claims 1, 6-10, 12-15, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement in that the claims contain subject matter which does not convey to one skilled in the art that the inventors had possession of the claimed invention.

3. The rejection of Claims 1, 6-10, 12-15, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a pharmaceutical composition comprising CAMPATH-1H (humanized anti-CD52 antibody), modified by linkage to a CD52 mimotope selected from QTSSPSAD and QTSAAAVD, does not reasonably provide enablement for all other therapeutic proteins and therapeutic antibodies modified (i.e., bound or linked) with just any other peptide or molecule (i.e., compound)

wherein the therapeutic protein or therapeutic antibody has reduced side effects and produces a therapeutic effect by binding to the therapeutic target.

4. The provisional rejection of Claims 1, 6-10, 12-15, and 17 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 36-41 of co-pending Application Serial No. 09/979,948.

5. The rejection of Claims 1, 6-10, 12-15, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement as introducing new matter.

#### Statement of Facts

1. The present invention is defined broadly in Claim 1.
2. Claim 1 defines a pharmaceutical comprising a therapeutic antibody that binds to a therapeutic target.
3. The antibody, as defined in Claim 1, has been modified with a peptide that reduces binding of the antibody to the therapeutic target.
4. The modified antibody, as defined in Claim 1, is effective for reducing an immune response against the antibody.
5. The modified antibody, as defined in Claim 1, has reduced binding to the therapeutic target.

6. The modified antibody, as defined in Claim 1, includes an antibody combining site that binds to the therapeutic target.

7. The peptide with which the antibody is modified is bound to the antibody combining site of the antibody.

8. The pharmaceutical as defined in Claim 1 includes a pharmaceutical carrier.

9. Hale discloses the testing of the binding of Campath antibodies to various CD52 mimotopes. (Page 175, abstract; Page 179, column 2).

10. Hale did not modify the Campath antibody. (Page 176, column 2, line 36 to Page 177, column 1, line 2).

11. Hale tested the binding of unmodified Campath antibodies to various CD52 mimotopes through assays such as ELISA assays, and inhibition assays. (Page 177, column 1, line 21 to Page 178, column 2, line 27).

12. Figure 8 (Page 183, column 1) of Hale shows that two of the mimotopes tested by Hale inhibited binding of the unmodified Campath antibody to human lymphocytes.

13. The Examiner has taken the position that the written description of the application only reasonably conveys a therapeutic humanized anti-CD52 antibody, Campath-1H, modified by linking two different CD52 mimotopes, in which the antibody-mimotope conjugate reduced the



immune response and had a therapeutic effect by binding CD52. (See Final Rejection of January 29, 2008, Page 3, lines 21-26).

14. Those skilled in the art understand that different antibodies will have different antibody combining sites, and that the location of the antibody combining site of the antibody can be determined by routine experimentation.

15. One skilled in the art can modify an antibody combining site of the antibody by means known to those skilled in the art.

16. One skilled in the art would be able to determine through routine experimentation whether a peptide reduced binding of an antibody to a therapeutic target, and reduced the immune response against the antibody.

17. The Examiner has admitted that the specification is enabling for a pharmaceutical composition comprising Campath 1H modified by linkage to a CD52 mimotope selected from QTSSPSAD and QTSAAVD. (See Final Rejection of January 29, 2008, Page 5, lines 19-21).

18. One skilled in the art would be able to determine, by routine experimentation, how to bind peptides to antibody combining sites of antibodies other than Campath-1H.

19. A modified antibody can be tested by one skilled in the art using routine experimentation in order to determine whether binding to a therapeutic target has been reduced.

20. The fact that the amino acid sequence of an epitope has been altered does not mean that an antibody cannot bind to the unmodified epitope.

21. The specification of the above-identified application, at Page 8, lines 1-16, states that when an antibody in accordance with the present invention is modified, the site that is modified is a site which determines immunogenicity.

22. A Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee Due in application Serial No. 09/979,948 was mailed on September 12, 2008.

### Argument

#### The Rejection of Claims 1, 6, 9, 10 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

In the Final Rejection, from Page 9, line 26 to Page 10, line 10, the Examiner states that the fact that Hale was concerned with a different purpose or does not recognize that the CAMPATH-1H antibody, bound to a synthetic peptide, is effective for reducing an immune response against the antibody and for producing a therapeutic effect by binding to the therapeutic target, does not distinguish the claimed pharmaceutical comprising a therapeutic antibody bound to a peptide that inhibits binding

of the antibody to a therapeutic target, from the anti-CD52 humanized antibody, reversibly bound by a CD52 mimotope that inhibits binding of CAMPATH-1H to human lymphocytes expressing CD52. The Examiner also states that Hale discloses the antibody in various buffers, which reasonably can be interpreted as pharmaceutically acceptable carriers. (See also Advisory Action, Page 3, lines 52-61).

Applicants have responded to this point previously in their response to the Final Rejection filed on June 2, 2008, at Pages 2 and 3, as well as their response in support of a Request for Continued Examination filed on October 29, 2007, at Pages 2 and 3, and in their Amendment filed February 1, 2007, at Pages 4 and 5.

Also, at Page 3, lines 61 and 62 of the Advisory Action, the Examiner states that "Applicants' attention is directed to the fact that Claim 9 is not anticipated by Hale."

In the Final Rejection and earlier in the Advisory Action, the Examiner stated that Claims 1, 6, 9, 10, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hale. Clarification is hereby respectfully requested.

Furthermore, Claim 10 depends upon Claim 9, and Claim 17 depends upon Claim 10. Therefore, if Claim 9 is not anticipated by Hale, then Claims 10 and 17 also are not anticipated by Hale.

The present invention, as defined broadly in Claim 1, is directed to a pharmaceutical comprising a therapeutic antibody that binds to a therapeutic target. The antibody has been modified with a peptide that reduces binding of the antibody to the therapeutic target. The modified antibody is effective for reducing an immune response against the antibody, and produces a therapeutic effect by binding to the therapeutic target. The antibody includes an antibody combining site that binds to the therapeutic target. The peptide is bound to the antibody combining site of the antibody. The pharmaceutical also includes a pharmaceutical carrier.

Hale discloses the testing of the binding of Campath antibodies to various CD52 mimotopes. In the experiments of Hale, however, the Campath antibodies were not modified.

More particularly, Hale discloses various assays, such as ELISA assays and inhibition assays, to determine the binding of unmodified Campath antibodies to various mimotopes of the CD52 epitope to which Campath binds. (See Page 177, column 1, line 21 to Page 178, column 2, line 27) Such assays were conducted in order to characterize more precisely the epitope which is recognized by Campath antibodies, and to construct analogues of the epitope that would be useful in assays and for purifying unmodified Campath antibodies, as well as for further study of the antibody-antigen binding site.

Figure 8 of Hale (Page 183, column 1) shows that two of the mimotopes tested by Hale inhibited binding of the unmodified Campath antibody to human lymphocytes. Hale, however, does not disclose or even remotely suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art that the Campath antibody may be modified with such mimotopes in order to provide a modified antibody.

Hale is directed solely to studying the binding of unmodified Campath antibodies to CD52 mimotopes in order to aid in developing assays and in purifying Campath antibodies, as well as studying the antibody-antigen interaction between Campath antibodies and the CD52 epitope recognized by Campath, or mimotopes thereof.

In contrast to Hale, Applicants modify an antibody with a peptide in order to inhibit binding of the antibody to a therapeutic target, and to reduce the immune response against the antibody. Although binding of the antibody to a therapeutic target is inhibited, there is some binding of the antibody to the therapeutic target, and a therapeutic effect is produced. Thus, the modified antibody provides a therapeutic effect while an immune response to the antibody is reduced. Hale does not disclose, nor does Hale even remotely suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art such a modified antibody, as claimed by Applicants. Therefore, Hale does not anticipate Applicants' claimed antibody nor does Hale render Applicants'

claimed antibody obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be reversed.

The Rejection of Claims 1, 6-10, 12-15, and 17 Under 35 U.S.C. 112, First Paragraph, As Failing to Comply with the Written Description Requirement in that the Claims Contain Subject Matter, Which Does Not Convey to One Skilled in the Art that the Inventors Had Possession of the Claimed Invention.

The Examiner has taken the position that the written description of the application only reasonably conveys a therapeutic humanized anti-CD52 antibody, Campath-1H, modified by linking two different CD52 mimotopes, in which the antibody-mimotope conjugate reduced the immune response (i.e., cytokine release) and had a therapeutic effect by binding CD52. (See Final Rejection of January 29, 2008, Page 3, line 15 to Page 5, line 10; see also Advisory Action, Page 2, paragraphs 4 and 5).

Applicants previously have responded to this point in their response to the Final Rejection filed on June 2, 2008, at Page 4, as well as in their response in support of a Request for Continued Examination filed October 29, 2007, at Page 4, and their Amendment filed February 1, 2007, at Pages 7 and 8.

Contrary to the Examiner's allegations, the specification describes what the invention is as well as what the invention does. The present

invention is directed to a pharmaceutical that comprises a therapeutic antibody that includes an antibody combining site, and is modified with a peptide that is bound to the antibody combining site. Those skilled in the art understand readily that different antibodies will have different antibody combining sites, and that the location of the antibody combining site of an antibody can be determined by routine experimentation. Once the antibody combining site has been determined, one can modify the antibody by binding a peptide to the antibody combining site of the antibody by means known to those skilled in the art. In other words, once one skilled in the art has read what the modified antibody includes, one skilled in the art would be able to make the modified antibody by standard techniques known to those skilled in the art. Once the modified antibody is constructed, one skilled in the art would be able to determine through routine experimentation whether the peptide reduced binding of the antibody to the therapeutic target and reduced the immune response against the antibody. Therefore, for the above reasons and others, the specification provides a written description of the invention, and it is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, be reversed.

The Rejection of Claims 1, 6-10 12-15, and 17 Under 35 U.S.C. 112, First Paragraph, for Failing to Provide an Enabling Disclosure.

The Examiner, from Page 5, line 18 to Page 9, line 6 of the Final Rejection, has held that the specification reasonably does not provide enablement for all modified therapeutic proteins and modified therapeutic antibodies other than CAMPATH-1H modified by linkage to a CD52 mimotope selected from QTSSPSAD and QTSAAVD. (See also Advisory Action, paragraph bridging Pages 2 and 3).

Applicants previously have responded to this point in their response to the Final Rejection filed June 2, 2008, at Pages 4 through 7, in their response in support of a Request for Continued Examination filed October 29, 2007, at Pages 5 and 6, and in their Amendment filed February 1, 2007, at Pages 9 and 10.

As noted hereinabove, the Examiner has admitted that the specification is enabling for a pharmaceutical composition comprising Campath-1H modified by linkage to a CD52 mimotope selected from QTSSPSAD and QTSAAVD. (See Final Rejection of January 29, 2008, Page 5, lines 19-21.)

The Examiner has misunderstood Applicants' previous arguments in that the Examiner believes that such arguments were directed to showing that one skilled in the art would be able to make and test the invention, as



opposed to make and use. What Applicants assert is that one skilled in the art would know how to modify antibodies other than Campath-1H in accordance with the present invention. One skilled in the art would be able to determine, by routine experimentation how to bind peptides to antibody combining sites of other antibodies to provide modified antibodies. Once one has made a modified antibody, then one can test the modified antibody in order to determine whether binding to the therapeutic target has been reduced. Once one has tested and determined that binding of the modified antibody to the therapeutic target has been reduced, one skilled in the art then would know that such modified antibody can be used to provide a therapeutic effect while providing a reduced antibody response against the modified antibody, and therefore one skilled in the art is enabled to use the modified antibody. Thus, Applicants have enabled one skilled in the art to make and use the invention, and therefore the claims are patentable under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

The Examiner also states that even minor changes in an epitope sequence may affect the antigen binding-function of the antibody. (See Final Rejection, Page 7, lines 9-18; Advisory Action, Page 3, lines 19-35).

Applicants assert that such statement has no relevance with respect to enablement. The mere fact that the amino acid sequence of an epitope has been altered does not mean that an antibody cannot bind to an

unmodified epitope. The Examiner appears to be stating that just because an antibody may not be able to bind to a modified epitope, the antibody is not enabled. The possibility that an antibody may be able to bind to a native epitope but not to a modified epitope does not change the fact that the antibody binds to the native epitope, and therefore one skilled in the art is enabled to use the antibody.

The Examiner then states that even one amino acid difference in the peptide used for the modification of the therapeutic antibody could change dramatically the affinity or binding to the antibody combining site.

As noted hereinabove, one skilled in the art can determine whether a modified antibody has reduced binding to the therapeutic target, and whether there is a reduced antibody response against the modified antibody. If the modified antibody does not have reduced binding to the therapeutic target, and there is not a reduced antibody response against the modified antibody, then such modified antibody is not within the scope of the present invention. The mere fact that not every modified antibody is within the scope of the claimed invention does not mean that the present invention is not enabled.

In sum, the modified antibodies of the present invention may be constructed and tested by means which are known to those skilled in the art. Thus, the specification enables one skilled in the art to make modified

antibodies which have reduced binding to the therapeutic target, and have a reduced immune response against the modified antibody. In the rejection, the Examiner has confused the fact that not all modified antibodies are within the scope of the present invention with the legal standard for enablement. The present invention encompasses only modified antibodies with certain properties. Such properties can be determined readily by those skilled in the art, and the modified antibodies may be produced by techniques known to those skilled in the art. Therefore, contrary to the Examiner's allegations, the claimed invention is enabled. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, be reversed.

The Rejection of Claims 1, 6-10, 12-15, and 17  
Under 35 U.S.C. 112, First Paragraph, as Failing  
to Comply with the Written Description Requirement  
as Introducing New Matter

At Page 11, lines 11-16 of the Final Rejection mailed January 29, 2008, the Examiner has taken the position that Claim 1 defines a peptide-modified therapeutic antibody that is effective for reducing an immune response against the antibody, and that Applicants have not pointed out where support for such claim is found in the originally filed disclosure. (See also Advisory Action, Page 4, lines 2-5).

Applicants have not responded to this point previously.

At Page 8, lines 1-16, of the specification, it is stated that antibodies and proteins other than antibodies can be modified. It also is stated that therapeutic proteins other than antibodies may be modified if such proteins have biologically active sites which can be blocked transiently and where the activity of the site determines immunogenicity. Thus, by implication, when an antibody is modified, the site that is modified is a site which determines immunogenicity. Therefore, Applicants assert that the specification provides support for an antibody that is effective in reducing an immune response. Therefore, the claims do not introduce new matter, and it is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, be reversed.

The Provisional Rejection of Claims 1, 6-10, 12-15, and  
17 Under the Judicially Created Doctrine of Obviousness-type  
Double Patenting Over Co-pending Application Serial No. 09/979,948

With respect to the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection, a terminal disclaimer has been filed in parent application Serial No. 09/979,948, now U.S. Patent No. 7,465,790.

### Conclusion

For the above reasons and others, this application is in condition for allowance and it is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Raymond J. Lillie". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a small flourish at the end.

Raymond J. Lillie  
Registration No. 31,778  
Carella, Byrne, Bain, Gilfillan,  
Cecchi, Stewart & Olstein  
5 Becker Farm Road  
Roseland, NJ 07068-1739  
Phone: (973) 994-1700  
Fax: (973) 994-1744  
Email: rlillie@carellabyrne.com

## APPENDIX

### CLEAN COPY OF CLAIMS ON APPEAL

1. (Rejected). A pharmaceutical comprising:

(a) a therapeutic antibody that binds to a therapeutic target, said antibody being modified with a peptide that reduces binding of the antibody to the therapeutic target, said modified antibody being effective for reducing an immune response against the antibody and for producing a therapeutic effect by binding to the therapeutic target, wherein said antibody includes an antibody combining site that binds to the therapeutic target, and said peptide is bound to the antibody combining site of said antibody; and (b) a pharmaceutical carrier.

2-5 Cancelled.

6. (Rejected). The pharmaceutical of Claim 1 wherein the avidity of the modified antibody combined with the peptide is at least 4-fold less than the avidity of the unmodified antibody and no more than 100-fold less.

7. (Rejected). The pharmaceutical of Claim 6 wherein the antibody is an aglycosylated antibody.

8. (Rejected). The pharmaceutical of Claim 7 wherein only one of the chains of the antibody has a peptide linked thereto that binds to the antibody combining site.

9. (Rejected). The pharmaceutical of Claim 1 wherein the peptide

is reversibly bound to the antibody combining site, whereby the amount of antibody that binds to the target increases as the peptide is displaced from the antibody binding site.

10. (Rejected). The pharmaceutical of Claim 9 wherein the peptide bound to the antibody combining site is also linked to the antibody.

11. Cancelled.

12. (Rejected). The pharmaceutical of Claim 10 wherein the Fc portion of the antibody is aglycosylated.

13. (Rejected). The pharmaceutical of Claim 10 wherein binding of the antibody to the Fc receptor is essentially eliminated.

14. (Rejected). The pharmaceutical of Claim 10 wherein the antibody is a non-human antibody.

15. (Rejected). The pharmaceutical of Claim 10 wherein the antibody is a chimeric antibody.

16. (Withdrawn) A process for treating a mammal, comprising administering to a mammal the pharmaceutical of Claim 1 in an amount effective to both treat the mammal and reduce side effects against the protein.

17. (Rejected) The pharmaceutical of Claim 10 wherein the antibody is a humanized antibody.

## CLAIM SUPPORT SECTION

1. A pharmaceutical {Page 2, lines 10-14} comprising:
  - (a) a therapeutic antibody {Page 1, lines 9 and 19-23; Page 7, lines 16-24} that binds to a therapeutic target {Page 1, lines 19-25; Page 2, lines 10-14; Page 3, lines 10-12}, said antibody being modified with a peptide {Page 4, lines 24 to Page 5, line 7; Page 5, line 24 to Page 6, line 2; Page 7, lines 1-6; Page 10, lines 10-17} that reduces binding of the antibody to the therapeutic target {Page 1, lines 14-23; Page 2, lines 1-8, 15-21; Page 3, line 21 to Page 4, line 15} said modified antibody being effective for reducing an immune response against the antibody {Page 8, lines 1-16} and for producing a therapeutic effect by binding to the therapeutic target {Page 2, lines 1-8; Page 3, lines 8-12; Page 5, lines 17-21}, wherein said antibody includes an antibody combining site {Page 2, lines 10-14} that binds to the therapeutic target {Page 2, line 24 to Page 3, line 2}, and said peptide is bound to the antibody combining site {Page 4, line 21 to Page 5, line 7} of said antibody; and (b) a pharmaceutical carrier {Page 12, lines 12-14}.
6. The pharmaceutical of Claim 1 wherein the avidity of the modified antibody combined with the peptide is at least 4-fold less than the avidity of the unmodified antibody and no more than 100-fold less. {Page 11, lines 7-8}



7. The pharmaceutical of Claim 6 wherein the antibody is an aglycosylated antibody.

8. The pharmaceutical of Claim 7 wherein only one of the chains of the antibody has a peptide linked thereto that binds to the antibody combining site {Page 4, lines 4-5}.

9. The pharmaceutical of Claim 1 wherein the peptide is reversibly bound to the antibody combining site, whereby the amount of antibody that binds to the target increases as the peptide is displaced from the antibody binding site {Page 2, line 24 to Page 3, line 2}.

10. The pharmaceutical of Claim 9 wherein the peptide bound to the antibody combining site is also linked to the antibody {Page 3, line 24 to Page 4, line 2}.

12. The pharmaceutical of Claim 10 wherein the Fc portion of the antibody is aglycosylated.

13. The pharmaceutical of Claim 10 wherein binding of the antibody to the Fc receptor is essentially eliminated.

14. The pharmaceutical of Claim 10 wherein the antibody is a non-human antibody {Page 4, lines 10-11}.

15. The pharmaceutical of Claim 10 wherein the antibody is a chimeric antibody. {Page 8, line 24}

17. The pharmaceutical of Claim 10 wherein the antibody is a humanized antibody {Page 8, line 24}.

#356835 v1